

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is submitted responsive to the Office Action mailed April 10, 2007. Reconsideration of the application in light of the accompanying remarks and amendments is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Section 1, the Examiner did not approve the drawing corrections from the previous response, stating that Figure 3 needed to be labeled "New Sheet". By the present response, the drawing corrections are resubmitted as requested by the Examiner, and Figure 3 has been labeled "New Sheet" as requested.

A description of Figure 3 has been added to the Brief Description of the drawings.

The lead line for band 14 was shown in poor quality in the original drawings, but does in fact extend to the same element as it does in the replacement sheet of drawings. If the Examiner is of the opinion that this is not shown in the Figure with the original filing papers, it is believed that the lead line for 14, as then technically "corrected" in the replacement sheet of drawings, is clearly supported by the discussion in the specification at paragraphs [0028-0029]. It is submitted that a person skilled in the art given these paragraphs would clearly understand the correct placement of the lead line for band 14, which is as shown in the replacement sheet of drawings.

In connection with the assertion that Figure 3 is new matter, the Examiner suggested that Figure 3 be identified as schematically illustrating the interlacing of the present invention, and this language has been added to a description of Figure 3. It is submitted that this addresses any issue of new matter, and further that the showing of this figure is supported by the text of the application in any event. For example,

paragraph [0030] clearly discusses the mechanical interlacing of the present invention, which is illustrated in newly added Figure 3. In this regard, it is submitted first that Figure 3 is not new matter, and second that Figure 3 shows that which is described in paragraph [0030] of the specification. The definition in the present specification controls this term, and not the dictionary definition supplied by the Examiner. It is submitted that the definition of this term as set forth in paragraph [0030], while different from that set forth in the dictionary cited by the Examiner, is not sufficiently different that applicant cannot be its own lexicographer in connection with this term. It is submitted that the term is absolutely clear to a person skilled in the art given the benefit of a fair reading of the specification.

The Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide antecedent basis for the Mechanical deforming and pressure of claims 33 and 35. The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to paragraph [0030] of the specification, wherein each of these features is amply discussed.

The Examiner requested a correction to claim 22, and this correction has been made.

With respect to the rejection of claims 22-23 and 25-43 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, this lack of enablement rejection is respectfully traversed based at least upon the teachings of paragraph [0030], as well as paragraphs [0028-0029]. These paragraphs make clear what is meant by being interlaced, and give a step by step procedure as to how this is accomplished. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Turning to the rejection based upon prior art, it is submitted that with the amendment to clarify and positively

recite the subject matter of the invention, the prior art applied by the Examiner does not anticipate or obviate the claims. Specifically, JP '427 does not disclose a layer or band of material crimped into a flattened portion of the gas supply conduit and interlaced to produce a desired seal. Instead, JP '427 discloses a press which generates flat surfaces as would be understood by a person skilled in the art to which the invention pertains. JP '730 likewise discloses a flat part, not a profiled surface of a die. Thus, claim 22 its dependent claims are believed allowable.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 34-36 contained allowable subject matter, and this indication is thankfully acknowledged.

A request for extension of time accompanies this paper and authorizes a deposit account for that fee. It is believed that no additional fees are due in connection with this response. If any such fees or fee deficiencies are required in connection with this paper, please charged same to Deposit Account No. 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,
Ulrich Huperz

By /george a. coury/
George A. Coury
BACHMAN & LaPOINTE, P.C.
Reg. No. 34,309
Attorney for Applicants
Telephone: (203)777-6628
Telefax: (203)865-0297
Email: docket@bachlap.com

Date: September 10, 2007